

REMARKS

Claims 1, and 3-24 are now pending in this application. The Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 4 8-13, added claims 16-24, and canceled claim 2. Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 3-24 now pending in this application is respectfully requested in view of the following.

A. Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the Abstract because of a typographical error. The Applicant has provided a replacement paragraph for the Abstract on a separate page. The Applicant believes that the objection has been overcome, and thus, requests withdrawal of the objection.

B. Objection to the Claims

The Examiner objected to claims 1 and 8 because of a typographical error. The Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner. The Applicant believes that the objection has been overcome, and thus, requests withdrawal of the objection.

C. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-4, 8, 9, and 13-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Poor. (U.S Pat. No. 6,028,857).

Claims 1, 8 and 13, as amended, now recite an optimal routing path for transferring the signal from the source device through a set of the intermediate devices of the plurality of intermediate devices to the destination device, wherein the optimal routing path indicates the set of intermediate devices. The present invention provides the optimal path to the

intermediate devices that define the optimal path when transmitting the signal to a destination.

Poor '857 discloses a limited wireless network that specifies the constraints that the optimal path is to be in accordance with. However, Poor '857 fails to disclose that the optimal path is determined and provided by the device from which the signal originated. Accordingly, Poor '857 fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements now recited in amended claims 1, 8 and 13.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1, claim 9 depends from claim 8, and claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 13. Accordingly, Poor '857 fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements now recited in claims 2, 4, 9, 14 and 15 for at least the same reason discussed above with respect to claims 1, 8, and 13.

D. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 5 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Poor '857 in view of Hermann et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,633,757).

Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1 and claim 10 depends from claim 8. As discussed above with respect to claims 1, 8, and 13, Poor does not disclose an optimal routing path for transferring the signal from the source device through a set of the intermediate devices of the plurality of intermediate devices to the destination device, wherein the optimal routing path indicates the set of intermediate devices. Accordingly, Poor '857 fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements now recited in amended claims 5 and 10.

Hermann et al '757 does not cure the deficiencies of Poor '857. Hermann et al. '757 discloses a wireless network with devices have a transmitter and receiver. Hermann et al. does not disclose an optimal routing path for transferring the signal from the source device through a set of the intermediate devices of the plurality of intermediate devices to the destination device, wherein the optimal routing path indicates the set of

intermediate devices. Accordingly, the combination of Poor '857 and Hermann et al. 757 does not teach alone or in combination the elements now recited in claims 5 and 10.

Claims 6 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Poor '857 in view of in view of Brownrigg (U.S Pat. No. 6,044,062).

Claim 6 depends from independent claim 1 and claim 11 depends from claim 8. As discussed above with respect to claims 1, 8, and 13, Poor does not disclose an optimal routing path for transferring the signal from the source device through a set of the intermediate devices of the plurality of intermediate devices to the destination device, wherein the optimal routing path indicates the set of intermediate devices. Accordingly, Poor '857 fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements now recited in amended claims 6 and 11.

Brownrigg '062 does not cure the deficiencies of Poor '875. Brownrigg '062 does not disclose an optimal routing path for transferring the signal from the source device through a set of the intermediate devices of the plurality of intermediate devices to the destination device, wherein the optimal routing path indicates the set of intermediate devices. as set forth in amended claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, the combination of Poor '875 and Brownrigg '062 does not teach alone or in combination the elements now recited in claims 6 and 11.

Claims 7 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Poor '857 in view of in view of Feder et al. (U.S Pat. No. 6,512,754).

Claim 7 depends from independent claim 1 and claim 12 depends from claim 8. As discussed above with respect to claims 1, 8, and 13, Poor does not disclose an optimal routing path for transferring the signal from the source device through a set of the intermediate devices of the plurality of intermediate devices to the destination device, wherein the optimal routing path indicates the set of intermediate devices. Accordingly,

Poor '857 fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements now recited in amended claims 6 and 11.

Feder et al. '754 does not cure the deficiencies of Poor '875. Feder et al. '754 teaches using a satellite for long range transmission of data to a remote network. Feder et al. '754 does not disclose an optimal routing path for transferring the signal from the source device through a set of the intermediate devices of the plurality of intermediate devices to the destination device, wherein the optimal routing path indicates the set of intermediate devices. as set forth in amended claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, the combination of Poor '875 and Feder et al. '754 does not teach alone or in combination the elements now recited in claims 7 and 12.

E. Drawings

The Examiner objected to the Drawings. Formal Drawings are attached hereto. Acknowledgement that the Formal Drawing are acceptable is requested.

CONCLUSION

A fee transmittal sheet is also enclosed. No other fees are believed to be due at this time. Should any fee be required, however, please charge such fees to Swidler Berlin LLP Deposit Account No. 19-5127 (order no. 20864.0004).

Respectfully submitted,
SWIDLER BERLIN LLP

Dated: June 14, 2005

By: 

Chadwick A. Jackson, Registration No. 46,495
SWIDLER BERLIN LLP
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 424-7661 Telephone
(202) 295-8478 Facsimile